



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,244	12/16/2003	Mark A. Bresnan	F-773	6361

7590 06/18/2009
Michael J. Cummings
Pitney Bowes Inc.
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484

EXAMINER

WU, RUTAO

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3628

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/18/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES

Ex parte MARK A. BRESNAN, BERNARD E. GRACY,
AND JOANN MARTIN

Application No. 10/737,244
Technology Center 3628

Mailed: June 18, 2009

Before DELORES LOWE, *Review Team Paralegal*
LOWE, *Review Team Paralegal*.

ORDER RETURNING UNDOCKETED APPEAL TO EXAMINER

This application was electronically received by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on June 15, 2009. A review of the application revealed that it is not ready for docketing as an appeal. Accordingly, the application is herewith being returned to the Examiner to address the following matter requiring attention prior to docketing.

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A review of the file finds that the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal of the claims as provided in the Examiner's Answer mailed June 27, 2008 under the heading "Grounds of rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal" is either unclear or is not consistent with the grounds of rejection of claims set forth in the last Office action of record. The grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal as provided in the Examiner's Answer must be consistent with the last Office action of record, including any Advisory action responsive to any after final submissions. Furthermore, the examiner must provide a clear statement of whether examiner agrees or disagrees with the statement of grounds of rejection to be reviewed as set forth in the brief and an explanation of any disagreement. *See also Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (MPEP) § 1207.02 (8th ed. Rev. 6, Sept 2007) for details.

A review of the Examiner's Answer finds that it is unclear what rejected claims are on appeal as compared to the Appeal Brief and/or the Examiner's Answer does not clearly address differences between rejections set forth in the Examiner's Answer and those addressed in the brief.

Clarification of the record is required for all Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal for all claims.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that the application be returned to the Examiner:

- 1) to vacate the Examiner's Answer mailed June 27, 2008;
- 2) to generate a new Examiner's Answer setting forth the correct Grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal and to correct other sections of the Answer as may be required;
- 3) and to include the approval of the TC Director or his/her designee (as required for any new grounds of rejection); and
- 4) for such further action as may be appropriate.

If there are any questions pertaining to this Order, please contact the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences at 571-272-9797.

/DAL/

Michael J. Cummings
Pitney Bowes Inc.
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton CT 06484